DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 314 302 SO 020 321

AUTHOR Branson, Margaret Stimmann
TITLE International and Citizenship Education: Need and Nexus.
PUB DATE 18 Sep 89
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the International Conference on Constitutional Government and the Development of an Enlightened Citizenry (Los Angeles, CA, September 16-22 1989).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship Education; Comparative Education; Cultural Interrelationships; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethnocentrism; *Global Approach; *International Education; Patriotism; Political Attitudes; Social Studies

ABSTRACT

Two major efforts to redirect the school curriculum that are currently of special concern, not only to educators but to the general citizenry as well, are citizenship education and international or global education. Both deal with the development of competent and responsible citizens whose perspectives, knowledge, and skills will enable them to participate more effectively in local, state, national, and international affairs. Scholars have called for a new, less ethnocentric vision of U.S. history designed to provide a world-historical perspective, a perspective that will cultivate a sense of individual identification with the triumphs and tribulations of humanity as a whole. Due to the role which the United States plays in world affairs, U.S. citizenship is a passport to relevance in world affairs. This call for an expanded view of citizenship education is echoed by professional societies and the National Governors Association. There is, however, debate on the goals and contents of such programs. Some argue that the turning away from a U.S.-centered view promotes a cultural relativism that denies the import and unique value of the U.S. experience and way of life. Another implication of cultural relativism is the equation of all systems as humane or legitimate, when in fact they may not be. The variety of proposals for the content and scope of international education programs reflects the variety of rationales for the need of international education, as well as the fact that no intellectual heritage exists in this area. Good citizenship in today's interdependent world requires a broad, transnational outlook and a greater concern for the human rights of all the world's peoples. (PPB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED314302

# INTERNATIONAL AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION: NEED AND NEXUS

By Margaret Stimmann Branson
Administrator, Division of Instructional Services
Kern County Superintendent of Schools Office
Bakersfield, California

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

★ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
MARGARET BRANSON
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 020 321

A Paper Delivered To An International Conference on Constitutional Government and the Development of An Enlightened Citizenry

University of California at Los Angeles

September 18, 1989

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# INTERNATIONAL AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION: NEED AND NEXUS

Two major efforts to redirect the school curriculum which currently are of especial concern not only to educators but to other elements in society as well are citizenship education and international or global education. Each of these efforts has had its own adherents, and they often have acted independently of one another, sometimes even in competition with one another. That they have done so is regrettable, because citizenship and international education are not disparate elements, antithetical strands. A natural affinity exists between the two curricular priorities. Not only do they aim at improving our capacities for living humanely and justly with one another, they are concerned with the development of competent and responsible citizens whose perspectives, knowledge and skills will enable them to participate more effectively in local, state, national and international affairs.

This paper will begin by examining some of the more cogent expressions of need for internationalizing education and for conceiving of international education as a part of the broader and more traditional effort at citizenship education. Attention then will be focused on concerns about the substance or content

of international education. Finally the debate about whether an internationalized conception of citizenship fragments loyalties and subverts patriotism will be addressed.

At the outset it should be noted that the terms "international" and "global" will be used interchangeably throughout this paper. In the past some people have expressed strong preference for one term rather than another, but educators, legislators, the business community and interested laypersons now are inclined to treat these words as synonyms. There does appear to be some leaning toward the appellations "international", "internationalization", and even "transnational", however. International, global, or transnational education, whichever term is employed, can be said to be all education which has anything to do with interactions between sovereign states or non-state actors, such as transnational business enterprises, labor unions, professional societies, religious groups and a host of international organizations.

## INTERNATIONALIZING EDUCATION: The Need Perceived by Scholars

Despite debates about terms, there appears to be general agreement on the need to increase the knowledge of Americans about other lands, peoples, languages, governments, and issues which emanate from the world's growing interdependence. Scholars, professional organizations, the business community, and political leaders -- all have issued clarion calls for internationalizing education. Their motives and their goals, however, are often

quite different, and those differences sometimes have made it difficult for groups concerned with citizenship and/or international education to work together. Indeed, the goals of one group have even been viewed as suspect by another.

The nation's scholars have shown no hesitancy in speaking out on behalf of international education and in pointing out its connection to citizenship education. One of the first and most active scholars to see that nexus was Clark Kerr, former President of the University of California and later Chairman of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Kerr held that American education, like much of American life from about 1815 to 1940, was isolationist. Teaching about other countries, their peoples and cultures, political and economic systems and their languages was conspicuous by its absence. The neglect of international education, he said, was "shocking." The need to do something about that neglect was imperative.

> The schools in the United States introduced large numbers of immigrants to life in America and have provided citizenship training for generations. Now they must teach citizens of the world. That does not mean that there will be one world-wide culture or government; the task is different from that previously undertaken. It means that cultural diversity must be accepted and understood, and empathy for other cultures generated. It means helping people to learn to view the world through the eyes of another person who has different beliefs, different attitudes, and different assumptions.[1].

Other scholars joined with Kerr to make the case for internationalizing education. Two of them used platforms afforded them by virtue of their presidency of the prestigious American Historical Association. In his Presidential Address delivered at the 98th Annual Meeting San Francisco in 1983,

Philip Curtin called for nothing less than "a new world history" which would "challenge the more self-centered variety for a place in high school and college curricula." He told his fellow historians that even a course in Western Civilization "remains ethnocentric despite its broad scale." While Curtin was willing to concede that "self-knowledge is no doubt a good thing," he went on to qualify his statement by adding, "but, self-knowledge by itself is also a form of selfishness that can be dangerous to social health." That is why, Curtin insisted, "a new history" which would help students gain a world-historical perspective should be of concern to more than academics. "What we teach passes to a broader public and members of that public make political decisions that are crucial for us all." Curtin lamented the current state of affairs charging that "what we now see... even among those in the heights of power is a simplistic, tripartite division of the world into ourselves, our enemies, and the rest -- who do not count, even though they form the vast majority of the world's population."[2.]

Equally forthright was Akira Iriye in his 1988 Presidential Address to the American Historical Association. It is not enough, Iriye said, for historians to continue in their traditional ways. They must broaden their perspectives and accustom themselves to thinking of American history not just as national history, or even as part of transatlantic history, but also as an aspect of human history.

> To the extent that we seek to internationalize history, it would be unfortunate if our work merely nationalized it in the sense of stressing the uniqueness of each country's historical development. Sometimes it may be

> necessary to try to denationalize history in order to nationalize it, that is to find themes and responses common to a plurality of nations rather than those limited to specific subcategories of humanity.[3].

Philip Curtin's call for a new, less ethnocentric history designed to provide a world-historical perspective and Iriye's plea for themes and responses common to a plurality of nations found favor with another distinguished historian, William H. McNeill of the University of Chicago. In fact, McNeill went so far as to declare that it was "the moral duty of the historical profession to cultivate a sense of individual identification with the triumphs and tribulations of humanity as a whole."

The work of two other scholars, Harlan Cleveland and James N. Rosenau, needs to be mentioned, because they have long been in the forefront urging the wedding of international and citizenship education. Cleveland, who has served as Assistant Secretary of State, U.S. Ambassador to NATO, and President of the University of Hawaii, uses this syllogism to make his point:

> In the USA, the people sooner or later make the policies that guide our actions as a nation.
>
> The people are grown-up schoolchildren.
>
> Ergo, how we act as a nation depends on what schoolchildren come to know and learn to feel, and therefore how they act later on.[4].

Cleveland predicts that "Today's schoolchildren will be part of a new manifest destiny, less assertive in pretension yet worldwide in its scope of action. United States citizenship is thus a passport to relevance in world affairs. And it makes a feel for world affairs a requirement of citizenship."[5].

A prolific writer and long-time Professor of Political Science and International Relations at the University of Southern California, James N. Rosenau, sounds themes similar to those espoused by Harlan Cleveland.

> Our concepts of citizenship need to be updated. The responsibilities of citizenship in these complex times are far more extensive and elaborate than our textbooks, the mass media, and civic action groups appear to realize. Indeed, the United States is unlikely to make a through-going adaptation to the changing circumstances of our evermore interdependent world unless the concept of citizenship to which succeeding generations of students are exposed is brought into line with the choices that greater interdependence imposes on individuals in all walks of life...
>
> The challenges of interdependence must be perceived for what they are; and, to be so perceived, traditional perspectives must give way to transnational ones. More specifically, the attitudes, loyalties, and participatory behavior of citizens must undergo profound transformations. Interdependence is laden with potential for citizen education, a potential yet to be realized.[6]

## SUPPORT FOR INTERNATIONALIZING CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

American scholars are not alone in perceiving the need to expand the concept of citizenship education to encompass international education. Support has come from other quarters as well. Professional organizations ranging from the National Council for the Social Studies to the National Elementary School Principals Association to the National School Boards Association to the National Council for the Advancement of Citizenship -- and more -- have adopted resolutions, published special editions of their journals, provided workshops, and dispatched letters in support of the idea of internationalizing education in general

and citizenship education in particular. Some professional groups now are moving beyond declarations of support toward more assertive positions. Consider the resolution just adopted by The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) at its 44th Annual Conference in 1989. One of the largest and most politically active professional organizations, ASCD members called for an end to the "cultural myopia" of American schools and reaffirmed their support for citizenship education as the central purpose of education in a democracy. The text of the Resolution is worth pondering.

ASCD RESOLUTIONS, 1989 - #12 Global Education

> Teaching children about the world in which we live is an important and potentially controversial task. The task is made more difficult when schools are confronted by groups whose goals are to promote their own perspectives to the exclusion of other points of view. ASCD affirms that the central purpose of education in a democracy is to help educate citizens who can decide for themselves which national policies should be supported, promoted, and implemented. Points of view, which are sometimes sharply at odds with prevailing views must be readily available to students. Therefore, ASCD resolves to oppose efforts by any group to restrict the curricular content of programs such as global education to views that are popular or are labeled as mainstream. ASCD supports programs that present multiple perspectives and divergent points of view on international policy issues in order to encourage students to think critically, clearly, and independently.[7].

At almost the same time that ASCD took its stand the nation's governors published their Report of the Task Force on International Education. Governor Gerald L. Baliles of Virginia was Chairman of the National Governors' Association (NGA) while Governor Thomas H. Kean of New Jersey served as Chairman of the NGA Task Force on International Education. Under their

leadership, the Governors of the 50 states, commonwealths of Puerto Rico and the Northern Mariana Islands, and the territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands agreed to the following statement of need.

> Times have changed. Revolutionary advances in science, technology, communications and transportation have brought nations and peoples together. World trade and financial, economic and political developments have transformed disparate economic systems into a highly interdependent global marketplace. Today the nations that inhabit the planet are often more closely linked than neighboring states or villages were at the turn of the century. Yet these important changes are not reflected in the way many U.S. schools prepare students for citizenship. In educating students, the languages, cultures, values, traditions and even the location of other nations are often ignored. Schools and universities reflect the same lack of global understanding that pervades the nation from government and business leaders to school children.[8]

The Governors, recounting instances of their previous leadership in matters educational, said they had been in the forefront of reforming America's schools. They claimed credit for improving student assessment and the accountability of schools, for recognizing the professional nature of teachers' work and for enhancing the stature of teachers. Now, they said, "It is time for the Governors to take the lead in creating an international focus for our educational system." To do that the Task Force agreed that the nation's Governors need to:

- develop strategic plans for international education at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels.
- create coalitions of education, business and government.
- promote the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
- use the bully pulpit to promote international education; and

. remain responsive to changing needs in international education.[9].

## CONCERNS ABOUT CONTENT

At first glance it might appear that given the broad support of diverse constituencies there would be a little debate about internationalizing the curriculum. But such has not been the case. Debate has centered on the goals and the content or substance of the curriculum. Among the more vocal critics of the goals proposed by the international leaning scholars cited earlier, are Alan Bloom, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Chicago and William J. Bennett, former U.S. Secretary of Education. Bloom took exception in what became a best-selling book, The Closing of the American Mind. He lamented that "Civic education turned away from concentrating on the Founding to concentrating on openness based on history and the social sciences." Education which teaches that we should not be ethnocentric or think that our way is better than others is nothing more than "cultural relativism," he charged. "The intention is not so much to teach the students about other times and places as to make them aware of the fact that their preferences are only that -- accidents of their time and place." Bloom goes on to argue that "Relativism has extinguished the real motive of education, the search for a good life... Thus what is advertised as a great opening is a great closing. No longer is there a hope that there are great wise men in other places and times who can reveal the truth about life."[10].

William Bennett, one of the most strident critics, has called global education "another legacy from the Age of Aquarius that has been enshrined in too many of our social studies curricula." Nonetheless, Bennett insists:

> Now I happen to believe that a rational, realistic, and open-minded approach to international politics is possible for American high schools, But we do not have to teach this subject as diluted cultural anthropology, arguing in effect that all the world's governments are the same because all their people drink water and breathe air, and that no society's practices are better than any other's. To put the matter succinctly: you cannot fit liberal democracy and communism together on any map of the moral landscape.[11].

Bennett is adamant that children should be taught "what they need to know about other countries and their cultures" clearly and factually. That requires, he says, "the acknowledgement that not all systems are humane, decent, or legitimate. This is not ethnocentrism but, to the contrary, an honest commitment to the universal criteria that require us to discriminate among the societies of the world... The central fact of today's political world is the defensive opposition of the United States and its democratic allies to the Soviet Union and its empire."[12].

What should America's students be taught "clearly and factually"? Bennett offers some rather explicit ideas about their curriculum.

> Students should learn geography and foreign languages, some foreign literature, and a lot of European history. They should be familiar with Western Civilizations' religious traditions, and the central place of religion in the lives of its peoples. They should be aware of totalitarianism's contempt for the triumph of religious liberty in the West and of the unnatural superseding of God by man and state under communism.
>
> Our children should know first about themselves. About American literature and American history. And American

democracy. And then they should know about totalitarian regimes...

In short, I am suggesting that the best global education for American students is the truth -- the truth about ourselves, our political culture, and our intellectual legacy. And the truth about the world, in all its friendly and hostile aspects, for all its good and all its evil. Though our scholars and our statesmen are forever adding to its finer contours, we are, most of us, agreed what the bulk of the truth looks like. it is high time, I think, that we begin making sure our children can see it, too."[13].

While Bennett's proposed curriculum is ideologically premised, the content proposed by the nation's Governors is pragmatic. The Governors stress the importance of producing "internationally literate" graduates because "employees are needed who can develop new products appropriate to other markets... To compete Americans must know more about their economic partners and competitors, allies and foes. To do business overseas Americans must understand the customer's language and customs."[14].

International education should become a part of the basic education of all students, according to the Governors. "In an age of world economic competition, knowledge of other countries, political systems, and cultures cannot be reserved just for those who complete high school or pursue postsecondary education. To become fully functioning citizens, all children starting from the earliest grades must learn of the broader world."[15].

The Governors suggest that the states "require" separate study units on world culture and world history in the basic curriculum. Those basic units or courses would lay the foundation for more advanced knowledge in international

education. The Task Force Report cites approvingly the curriculum recommended for all 9th and 10th grade students in New York State. Study of the world, for New York students, is divided into seven geographic areas: Africa, South Asia, East Asia, Latin America, Western Europe and the Middle East. Each are has five key focuses: historical geography, history from the colonial period, contemporary nations and cultures, economic development and international relations.

While most educators are grateful for the Governors' interest in internationalizing education, some take strong exception to their economic orientation. The editors of Global Pages, a publication of the Immaculate Heart College Center and closely associated with Women Associated for Global Education (W.A.G.E.) write that:

> Global Pages would like to take issue with the National Governors' Report. Contrary to the general trend of accolades, we find the report's analysis to be shortsighted, and narrowly framed by a notion of a competitive world community in which the United States faces omnipresent and fundamental threats to its security and power... We find such a perspective to be myopic and, in many ways, antithetical to the reasons that many educators are introducing global perspectives into their classrooms. For many of us, the goal of international education is not to reassert U.S. power in a bipolar world, but to encourage a set of international relations amongst nations wherein there would be multiple centers of economic, political, cultural and social power and one where equitable systems of access to and distribution of those resources would be promoted.[16]

Other curriculum developers with more dispassionate approaches also have made specific recommendations about content. Many of them suggest organizing the curriculum using concepts and issues which they deem central to the education of globally

literate citizens. The work of Chadwick Alger and James Harf, Professors of Political Science at Ohio State University and long-time proponents of internationalization of the curriculum, is illustrative. They have identified five basic themes and three global issues which they believe would provide a better perspective on the growing linkages among states and societies. These are, however, only part of a larger array of relevant themes, but Alger and Harf believe they are particularly important ones:

1. Values - not only those of specific religions, nations and ethnic groups, but the growing efforts to declare, codify and implement common standards for life on the planet (e.g. The United Nations Charter, The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Law of the Sea conferences, etc.).

2. Transactions - series of networks of formal and informal political, military, economic, and social connections that links societies (e.g. the global economy, entertainment, tourism, sports, science, information, etc.).

3. Actors - (e.g. nation states, international nongovernmental organizations (INGOs), transnational or multinational corporations, states or provinces which engage in international trade, sister cities, etc.).

4 and 5. Procedures and Mechanisms - Procedures for routinized contact between international actors and modes of influence including negotiation and styles of violent behavior, ranging from terrorism to traditional warfare.

In addition to these themes, Alger and Harf recommend a study of global issues such as food, energy, population and environmental pollution. These and other issues which ought to engage students' attention have similar characteristics: 1) They transcend states boundaries, 2) Their urgency is expressed by the actors involved in the issue, 3) These issues exist precisely

because participating actors disagree over the nature of the problem, the nature of the solution or the appropriate policies for securing a more desirable future, and 4) They will persist under some format well into the future.[17]

Recommendations for elementary and secondary curricula made in the final Report of the Study Commission of Global Education (1987) also deserve attention. This "blue ribbon" Commission said that greater emphasis needed to be placed on four curricular areas which have been largely ignored or given inadequate attention or treatment.

1. Understanding of the world as a series of interrelated systems: physical, biological, economic, political and informational-evaluative.
2. The development of world civilizations as they relate to the history of the United States.
3. The diversity of cultural patterns both around the world and within the United States.
4. Training in policy analysis of domestic and international issues.[18]

The Commission then went on to make specific suggestions for both the elementary and secondary levels. These recommendations are interesting, because they include skill development, as well as civic and international content.

Recommendations for the Elementary Level

1. Examination of a variety of cultures.
2. Knowledge of the basic values expressed in our nation's political and economic institutions and their place in world history and experience.
3. Acquaintance with the history, art and literature of our own and other cultures.
4. Communications skills, including appreciation for languages other than English.

5. Knowledge of basic physical and cultural geography.

6. Introduction to basic concepts of social studies, such interdependence, conflict, context, and multiple perspectives.

7. Practice in social-interaction skills.

8. Activities that increase awareness of beliefs and values.

Recommendations at the Secondary Level

1. Study of Western and other world civilizations.

2. In-depth study of at least two other cultures, including a non-European culture, in addition to that of the United States.

3. Continuing study of physical and cultural geography of the world as a physical system and as a biological system.

4. Acquaintance with the basic facts and concepts of our economy and global economics.

5. Study of and experience with the processes of United States government structures.

6. Study of comparative political systems, systems of communications and their effects, and comparative systems of political and moral evaluation.

7. Study of the skills of public policy formation and experience in analysis of important policy issues.

8. Study of language, especially English.

There are many prescriptions for internationalizing the curriculum, as the foregoing discussion indicates, and there is so much to teach and learn that it would be easy, as R. Freeman Butts suggests, to "get overwhelmed by studying all the aspects of all the world's peoples and cultures."[19].

What accounts for the abundance ofsuggested curricula and the seeming inability of study commissions, professionals, and the public to agree on one or a limited number? Richard Little

answers that question in part in a thoughtful essay on the study and teaching of international relations at the university level. Little says "The decision to encourage teaching and research on international relations was made after the First World War. The violence and destruction wrought by that War convinced some of the academic establishment that the subjects of war and peace should be taught and studied systematically as part of the effort to insure against the recurrence of such a disaster."[20].

The problem, however, was that there was no "established area of knowledge from which to create a new discipline... There was, therefore, a desire to study international relations, but no intellectual heritage on which to draw. As a consequence... there was a small band of academics in search of a subject."[21].

Many of the initial doubts about the "pedagogic virtue" of international studies stemmed from the absence of "an intellectual heritage." As Little explains, "In the first place, there was no sense of a discipline boundary which could identify and encompass its members and towards which prospective members could gravitate... At the heart of the problem seemed to lie an amorphousness of the subject matter; how were the boundaries of the discipline to be defined? Just what was to be taught to students in this area?"[22].

That amorphousness and the absence of disciplinary boundaries has continued to plague both citizenship education and international education. So, too, has the lack of a theory-guided approach. In the absence of generally accepted boundaries and bereft of the kind of guidance which theory provides, both

citizenship and international education have floundered in the past and may continue to do so in the future, unless their scope and limits are more clearly defined.

## LOYALTY, PATRIOTISM AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

That efforts at internationalizing the curriculum and redefining citizenship education to incorporate a global dimension have not been controversy-free is hardly surprising. For one thing, the topics with which both citizenship and international education are concerned are themselves controversial. Secondly, as has been pointed out, neither citizenship nor global education have been well defined; their boundaries are fluid. Citizenship and global education now are pretty much what their practitioners say they are. Third, unclear and confused statements about the goals of global education have fueled the perception that it is a threat to patriotism and antithetical to national loyalties.

One controversy about global education which began as a local dispute eventually drew national attention. A brief review of that controversy is instructive. It began when the paper "Blowing the Whistle on Global Education'" was written by Gregg L. Cunningham and circulated by Thomas G. Tancredo, Director, U.S. Department of Education in Denver, Colorado. In his paper, Cunningham attacked the Center for Teaching International Relations (CTIR), a part of the Graduate School of International Studies at the University of Denver and the curriculum materials it produced. Even though the Cunningham-Tancredo paper conceded

that "patriotic love of country, commitment to this nation's leadership responsibility are in no way incompatible with an international consciousness," it found great fault with the CTIR materials and, by extension, with global education in general.[23.]

Some of the specific complaints about the curriculum were:

1. Defense related issues are treated in a"pacifistic" even "capitulationist" manner.
2. Redistribution of world resources and wealth are over-emphasized.
3. "One world" is promoted over national sovereignty.
4. Cooperation is overemphasized and competition is down-played.
5. Free enterprise economics is "skewed toward disapproval".
6. Lesson plans pose questions that invade family privacy.
7. The materials imply "a moral equivalent" between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Incensed by what they perceived to be an unfair attack on international education, social studies professionals appealed for help to their professional organization, The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS). That organization responded by asking two of its former presidents to serve as co-chairmen of an Ad Hoc Committee on Global Education. The Committee was asked to examine the charges being leveled against global education in general and the CTIR materials in particular. As it was expected to do, the Committee came to the defense of international education, but it did offer some word of caution to its practitioners.

> ...unclear and confused statements of the aims of global education can fuel the perception that it aspires to inculcate a "one-worldism" that fails to

give due place to national loyalties and special duties.[24].

The Committee said that the "World Citizen Curriculum" produced by CTIR had failed to "give due place to national loyalties" and that it pointed up the "dangers of carelessness with its imprecise use of the term 'citizen'."[25].

The NCSS Board of Directors not only accepted unanimously the Ad Hoc Committee's Report, it proceeded to develop "emergency packets" containing the organization's "Position Statement on Global Education" and a set of guidelines for professional who might be challenged in the future.[26].

The Cunningham-Tancredo Paper was neither the first nor the last attack on global education. Some of the challenges to internationalization have been little more than irrational, emotional outcries, but some have been reasoned critiques. One such widely read and often quoted critique is that written by Paul Gagnon for the Education for Democracy Project, a joint effort of the American Federation of Teachers, the Educational Excellence Network, and Freedom House. Gagnon speaks of the "current vogue" for global education and says that "by the nature of their field, global educators must spend a good deal of their time saying nothing very specific but searching for principles of selection." Their high aspirations are unlikely to be realized, he says, because of "the patent conflict between (their) high aspirations and the absurd constrictions of the American secondary school curriculum... There is no foundation in most American schooling upon which to build anything close to sophistication about the world's people and world affairs."[27].

One reason - and an important one - according to Gagnon, that prevents American secondary school students from "building anything close to sophistication" is that their textbooks are "so bland and evasive over controversial issues. It has been disappointing at times to find them critical only of Western (and sometimes Soviet) societies and actions, as though it would be 'ethnocentric' to hold Third World peoples to the same standards we apply to ourselves."[28].

The textbooks used in American schools, Gagnon alleges, "are too frequently pious, reverential, and uncritical about non-Western religions, values and cultures, as though human failings were not common to all mankind. It is hardly a promising approach to 'global consciousness', much less to sensible views of history and politics... Honestly to face what goes wrong, at home and abroad, and then to search for explanations regardless of their messiness, is indispensable to informed citizenship."[26].

But the Supreme goal for schools, Gagnon insists, is "to purposely impart to their students the learning necessary for an informed, reasoned allegiance to the ideals of a free society." That means they must transmit to each new generation the political vision of liberty and equality that unites us as Americans -- and a deep loyalty to the political institutions our founders put together to fulfill that vision."[30].

Does that kind of rhetoric imply a wish for a parochial approach to the world's history and its present day problems? Gagnon claims it does not. "We do not ask for propaganda, for crash courses in the right attitudes, or for knee-jerk patriotic

drill. We do not want to capsulize democracy's argument into slogans, or pious texts, or bright debaters' points. The history and nature and needs of democracy are much too serious and subtle for that."[31].

Gagnon is undoubtedly right when he says that the nature and needs of democracy today are serious concerns; but, as R. Freeman Butts reminds us, "A sense of obligation and responsibility manifested by loyalty, patriotism, discipline and duty is still needed as a social and political glue, if the structure of the democratic policy is to persist, let alone thrive."[32].

Inculcating a sense of obligation and responsibility does not require a return to the jingoistic patriotism which in the past was mistakenly equated with loyalty or obligation only to one's own nation and people. Such "patriotism" all too often manifested itself as xenophobia or militarism. Real patriotism and good citizenship in today's interdependent world requires a broader transnational outlook and a greater concern for the human rights of all the world's peoples.

## Bibliography


1. Kerr, Clark. "Education for Global Perspectives," The Annals of the American Academy of Political Science, Vol. 422 (March, 1979): p. 113.

2. Curtin, Philip. "Depth, Span and Relevance," The American Historical Review 89 (Feb[illegible]ry, 1984): pp. 1 and 3.

3. Iriye, Akira. "The Internationalization of History," The American Historical Review 94 (February, 1989): p. 4.

4. Cleveland, Harlan. "The World We're Preparing Our Schoolchildren For," Social Education 50 (October, 1986): p. 416.

5. Ibid.

6. Rosenau, James N. "Teaching and Learning in a Transnational World," Educational Research Quarterly 8 (1983): pp. 29 and 31.

7. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, "Resolutions, 1989," Memorandum. Washington, D.C.

8. Report of the Task Force on International Education. Thomas H. Kean, Chairman (Washington, D.C.: The National Governors' Association, 1988), p. 8.

9. Ibid., p. 26.

10. Bloom, Allan. The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987. pp. 29, 30 and 34.

11. Bennett, William J. Our Children and Our Country. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988. p. 206.

12. Ibid., p. 207.

13. Ibid., pp. 208 and 209.

14. Report of the Task Force on International Education, op.cit., p. 15.

15. Ibid., p. 21.

16. "The National Governors' Report: A Myopic View?" The Editors, Global Pages 7 (April-June, 1989): p. 5.

17. For a more detailed discussion see Chadwick F. Alger and James M. Harf, "Global Education: Why? For Whom? About

What?" in Promising Practices in Global Education: A Handbook with Case Studies, ed. Robert E. Freeman (New York: National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, 1986), pp. 1-13.

18. Study Commission on Global Education. The United States Prepares for Its Future. New York: Global Perspectives in Education, Inc. 1987.

19. Butts, R. Freeman. The Civic Mission in Educational Reform: Perspectives for the Public and the Profession. Stanford University, California: Hoover Institution Press, 1989. p. 30.

20. Little, Richard. "A Paradigmatic Approach to Teaching International Relations to Mid Career Students," in The Study and Teaching of International Relations, ed. R. C. Kent and G. P. Nielsson (London: Frances Pinter Ltd., 1980), p. 160.

21. Ibid.

22. Ibid., p. 162.

23. For a more extended discussion of the Cunningham-Tancredo controversy, see "Global Education: In Bounds or Out?": A Report Submitted to the Board of Directors, National Council for the Social Studies by the Ad Hoc Committee on Global Education, Stanley Wronski and Jean E. Fair, Co-Chairmen. Social Education 51 (April/May, 1987): pp. 242-249.

24. "Global Education: In Bounds or Out?" op.cit., pp. 246.

25. Ibid., p. 249.

26. National Council for the Social Studies, "Position Statement on Global Education." Social Education 46 (January, 1982): pp. 36-38.

27. Gagnon, Paul. Democracy's Untold Story: What World History Textbooks Neglect, A Publication of the Education for Democracy Project Published by the American Federation of Teachers, 1987. pp. 31-32.

28. Ibid., p. 140.

29. Ibid.

30. Ibid., p. 14.

31. Ibid., p. 18.

32. Butts, R. Freeman. op.cit., p. 299.